

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**Carson City Growth Management Commission Regular Meeting**  
**Tuesday, December 20, 2022 • 10:30 AM**  
**Community Center Robert “Bob” Crowell Boardroom**  
**851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada**

**Commission Members**

**Chair – Jay Wiggins**

**Vice Chair – Teri Preston**

**Commissioner – Charles Borders, Jr.**

**Commissioner – Paul Esswein**

**Commissioner – Nathaniel Killgore**

**Commissioner – Sena Loyd**

**Commissioner – Richard Perry**

**Staff**

Hope Sullivan, Community Development Director

Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

Todd Reese, Deputy District Attorney

Stephen Pottéy, Sr. Engineering Project Manager

Heather Manzo, Associate Planner

Tamar Warren, Senior Deputy Clerk

**NOTE:** A recording of these proceedings, the board’s agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the Public Meeting Clerk during the meeting are public record. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder’s Office and are available for review during regular business hours.

The approved minutes of all meetings are available on [www.Carson.org/minutes](http://www.Carson.org/minutes).

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION**

**1. CALL TO ORDER – GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION**

(10:30:11) – Vice Chair Preston called the Growth Management Commission meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

**2. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

(10:30:24) – Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Chairperson Jay Wiggins	Absent	
Vice Chair Teri Preston	Present	
Commissioner Charles Borders, Jr.	Present	
Commissioner Paul Esswein	Present	
Commissioner Nathaniel Killgore	Present	
Commissioner Sena Loyd	Absent	
Commissioner Richard Perry	Present	

**3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

(10:30:46) – Commissioner Borders led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

(10:31:04) – Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

**5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – JUNE 29, 2022.**

(10:31:30) – Vice Chair Preston introduced the item and entertained comments or changes; however, none were forthcoming. He also entertained a motion.

**(10:31:40) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve the minutes of the June 29, 2022 Growth Management Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Killgore.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (4-0-1)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Borders
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Killgore
<b>AYES:</b>	Preston, Borders, Esswein, Killgore
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	Perry
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Wiggins, Loyd

**6. MEETING ITEMS**

**6.A GM-2022-0273 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REQUESTED SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT, INCLUDING WATER USE IN CARSON CITY, THE IMPACT OF POPULATION GROWTH ON CARSON CITY ROADWAYS, FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT AND TRANSPORTATION INITIATIVES.**

(10:32:24) – Vice Chair Preston introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan gave background and explained that during the Growth Management Annual Review held on June 29, 2022, staff had explained that it could not provide a statistical analysis of water use due to the changes in behavior experienced during the COVID-19 Pandemic and the related emergency lockdown. Based on a previous request by the Commission to discuss the impact of the City’s growth on roads and floodplain management as well, Ms. Sullivan noted that she had invited the Public Works Department to provide the additional information.

(10:35:05) – City Engineer Randy Rice reviewed a PowerPoint presentation, incorporated into the record at <https://www.carson.org/home/showpublisheddocument/83207/638072091878900000>, regarding the water usage threshold and recommended setting that threshold at 10,000 to 12,000 gallons per day (GPD) based on the current usage. He explained that with the current growth rate, the City’s water usage had decreased. Mr. Rice’s presentation also included a section on building in a floodplain per the Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC) 12.09 and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations, using the Anderson Ranch West subdivision as an example. He also responded to clarifying questions. Briana Greenlaw of the Public Works Department explained how they were working with FEMA to update

their overall models for better data and to ensure the same standards are met everywhere in the United States.

(11:10:49) – Transportation Manager Chris Martinovich continued the presentation and reviewed the existing local road and pavement conditions and the impact of development on those roads. He also reviewed proposed funding mechanisms being considered by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Martinovich highlighted traffic impact study goals and objectives which would mitigate existing gaps and deficiencies resulting from the cumulative effect of development. He defined the key stakeholders and the inputs received from each of them. Mr. Martinovich also responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners. Commissioner Esswein recommended reducing road widths to lower maintenance costs. Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments and reminded the audience that the Board would not respond to each comment; however, Staff would address the issues at the conclusion of the public comment portion of the meeting.

(11:39:09) – Betsy Strasburg explained that Mr. Martinovich had been invited to speak to an audience of 23 people; therefore, she was familiar with his presentation. However, she had been surprised to hear that an advisory committee had been formed for “vetting the options” and requested additional information on the committee.

(11:32:06) – Heather Koche believed that the “\$29 million in the [COVID] rescue fund should have been put towards this.” She also objected to “so many projects being pushed at once,” citing speeding issues and injuries to animals. Ms. Koche inquired “why is it that this is now being talked about when all these efforts and pushing these projects? They should have been gone through with all the things with the roads and the flooding, and everything else.” She called the developments “out of hand and out of control” without any impact studies being done – especially since “we’re in a recession.”

(11:35:05) – Ralph Thomas believed that the deferred maintenance backlog will get worse each year. He cited his past experience in transportation and asphalt maintenance and recommended separating road maintenance expenses from other Public Works projects due to the rising contractor costs. He recommended performing the chip sealing and other maintenance work in-house to save costs.

(11:37:58) – Richard Nagel noted that asphalt is “the most expensive way to put a road in, where concrete is becoming much cheaper.” He believed “we’re heading into a recession” and anticipated a “shortfall in budgets” and recommended partnering with Douglas and Washoe counties “to keep our people employed.” He recommended “real budgetary management solutions to move on from here.”

(11:40:09) – Deni French believed that waste management was “doing pretty well” and he objected to their “golden contract situation” because he could not choose who collected his trash. He wished to see more of their funds dedicated to the roads. Mr. French believed that electric cars are not paying their fair share toward roads and noted “you’re really crowding me out of a community I love,” adding that many are not “sharing that responsibility.”

(11:43:42) – Sue Masiello introduced herself as a Manhattan Drive resident and explained that the roads near her are full of weeds and requested that utility companies be “responsible for fixing what they have done.” She also believed that many of the Anderson Ranch homes had garages that accommodated only one vehicle and that the driveways could not accommodate large pickup trucks. She objected to narrowed

roads which would create problems for those that park on the streets. Ms. Maciello cited the example of San Francisco requiring all developments to provide adequate parking on their lots and recommended Carson City adopt the same requirement.

(11:46:10) – Karen Stephens objected to the new developments in floodplains because it “disturbs the ecology of the property. Where are the insects and birds and animals that were living there...where are they supposed to go?” She believed that the developments are “ruining our city,” and wished to understand how the contractors are contributing to maintenance. She stated that the taxpayers that are not even using some of the roads “are stuck with the burden of paying for them,” adding that she had nine percent cost of living increases in the seven years she had been retired;” therefore, she did not wish to pay additional taxes. She recommended slowing down the development and not “push[ing] more taxes on the people.” Ms. Stephens believed that the increase in the homeless population was due to “taxing.”

(11:48:53) – Joedy Ussery introduced himself as an Airport Road resident and noted that many animals utilize the floodplain. He believed that eliminating the floodplain would cause more flooding, especially at the location of the new homes. Mr. Ussery cited the example of some homes in South Carson City where the citizens had been flooded 20 years ago, and the city had paid for the mitigation of mold, etc. He also believed that building during a drought “doesn’t make any sense” and objected to construction vehicles using Airport Road as children used it to go to Empire Elementary School.

(11:51:30) – Paula Peters wanted to “slow down issuing building permits” due to the “major problems generating funds for roadwork.” She objected to the City’s funding of the Virginia and Truckee Railway because it diverted funds from the City’s roads. She also objected to additional growth at a time of drought.

(11:52:49) – Ms. Sullivan noted that she had not heard many questions; however, she had noted concerns based on public comments. She recommended that Ms. Strasburg connect with Mr. Martinovich to understand the role of the Advisory Committee highlighted earlier in Mr. Martinovich’s presentation. Ms. Sullivan also addressed the comments regarding growth in general. She explained that the Planning Commission also served as the Growth Management Commission (which was a standing commission), which meets annually to review Carson City’s growth data and its ability to provide services such as water, sewer, police, transportation, fire, schools, and health whose opinions are sought by Community Development to understand the impact of growth on their ability to serve the community. She stressed the fact that decisions made by the Growth Management Commission consider “the impact of their decisions on the ability of the City to serve and provide the necessary public services of this community.” Ms. Sullivan clarified that impact reports are done to ensure discretionary decisions are made based on the impact on City services. She invited those raising the issues to stay for the rest of the meeting to see how the Commission makes its decisions.

(11:55:33) – Mr. Rice acknowledged the funding issues, especially relating to the roads. He also addressed the comments relating to the City “pushing development.” He explained that “a developer wants to develop their property for the best use and value they think they can get out of that property. It’s not Staff’s goal or job to push or deny that development,” adding that they follow the letter of the law and look at zoning and engineering requirements in addition to determining whether the market is right for that development. Mr. Rice anticipated a drop-off in development as home sales had gone down “substantially.” He believed that it was important for the public to know that Staff would make certain sewer and water are adequate, adding that it was incorrect to believe concrete was cheaper than asphalt and it required reinforcement which added to the cost-per-mile rate and made it difficult to perform road maintenance, especially on local

roads. Mr. Rice addressed the suggestion to perform repairs utilizing local crews and noted that normally contractors have access to better pricing. Vice Chairperson Preston thanked the presenters. This item was not agendized for action.

**6.B GM-2022-0504 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM CARSON CITY HOLDINGS, LLC (“APPLICANT”) FOR APPROVAL OF DAILY WATER USAGE ABOVE 15,000 GALLONS PER DAY FOR A PROPOSED CONGREGATE CARE FACILITY ON PROPERTY ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (“RC”), LOCATED AT 4500 NORTH CARSON STREET, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 007-531-26.**

(12:01:15) – Vice Chair Preston entertained disclosures. Commissioner Borders encouraged members of the public to read the Growth Management Plan posted on the City’s Website and reminded everyone that the Commission does not have the power of the purse. He also read into the record a prepared disclosure statement, advised of no disqualifying conflict of interest, and stated that he would participate in discussion and action. Vice Chair Preston introduced the item.

(12:03:32) – Ms. Ferris gave background and presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, and recommended approval as Staff had been able to make both findings, outlined in the Staff Report, in the affirmative. Mr. Pottéy clarified that an updated daily water usage had been submitted by the applicant which had indicated usage under the 15,000 gallons-per-day threshold; however, after evaluating the per-bed water usage of five years in all the congregate facilities in the City, the number had shown higher than anticipated by the project; therefore, Public Works had decided to apply those figures to this project. Mr. Pottéy also responded to clarifying questions. He informed Vice Chair Preston that the estimated timeframe to upgrade the sewer connection on College Parkway was five to ten years and that it was 50 percent full.

(12:11:16) – Applicant representative and project architect Pete Wilday thanked Staff for their help and for the way the City is “approaching growth.” He also noted that he agreed with the Conditions of Approval. Westex Consulting Engineers Senior Project Manager Chris Moltz cites his previous interactions with Carson City Staff and clarified that the project would not require new roads as a former Michael Hohl Automotive property will be converted into a congregate-care facility, adding that it will use less water than currently anticipated. Mr. Moltz also complimented Staff for their professionalism and the added water usage study as noted by Mr. Pottéy. Mr. Wilday confirmed that their water study was based on functions at full capacity, with 20 percent of the rooms being used by only one patient, and believed that they would most likely use 12,000 gallons-per-day. He also confirmed for Vice Chair Preston that they had no issues with reporting their water usage annually, adding that their staff would undergo training on water conservation. Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments.

(12:17:55) – Shellie Shannon introduced herself as a Carson City native and noted that the residents of the assisted living facility may use less water; however, those moving into their homes would be using water too. There were no additional comments; therefore, Vice Chair Preston entertained a motion.

(12:18:54) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve GM-2022-0504 based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval included in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (5-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Borders
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Esswein
<b>AYES:</b>	Preston, Borders, Esswein, Killgore, Perry
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Wiggins, Loyd

**7. PUBLIC COMMENT**

(12:19:36) – Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

**8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURN AS THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION**

(12:19:56) – Vice Chair Preston adjourned the Growth Management Commission meeting at 12:19 p.m.

The Minutes of the December 20, 2022 Carson City Growth Management Commission meeting are so approved on this 31<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2023.